Blackburn Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Blackburn Elementary School

3904 17TH ST E, Palmetto, FL 34221

https://www.manateeschools.net/blackburn

Demographics

Principal: Adrienne Vos

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: D (35%) 2016-17: C (41%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

> * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Manatee County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org.](http://www.floridacims.org)

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Blackburn Elementary School

3904 17TH ST E, Palmetto, FL 34221

https://www.manateeschools.net/blackburn

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	70%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	D	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Manatee County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Blackburn Elementary is to provide an inclusive highly-engaged environment aimed to build our learners towards success: academically, emotionally, and socially.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Blackburn Elementary is to ensure all students become resourceful, independent thinkers who set goals, challenge themselves to be problem solvers, and become positive and productive citizens. This is accomplished by a commitment to engaging students through instruction that is researched-based, differentiated, and embeds instructional best practices. This commitment will ensure both social and academic confidence, promote risk-taking, encourage initiative, and meet the unique needs of all students.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Singleton, Latrina	Principal	*Teacher Evaluation *School Improvement lead *Office and Support Staff Evaluator *ILT/Data team chair *Data/Instructional Coaching *Community Outreach *Facilities * FTE Administrator *Leadership Team Chair *Roster Verification *SAC Facilitator/Member *MTSS Administrator
Delk, Danielle	Assistant Principal	*Teacher Evaluations *Paraprofessional Supervision and Evaluation *Member of Safety Committee *ILT/Data team member *Professional Development Coordinator *Administrator Overseeing Test Administration *Community Outreach and Business Partners *PBIS member
Robinson, April	Dean	*Discipline *Instructional Coaching-Classroom Learning Environment *PBS *ILT- First Grade *Data Team Member *Bullying Contact *School Testing Coordinator
Linton, Lisa	Instructional Coach	*New Teacher Induction/Development *Coordinator of teacher professional learning materials *ILT Team Member *Coordinator of Extended Hour K-5 *Modeling and coaching literacy strategies *Data Team Member

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/1/2016, Adrienne Vos

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
43

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: D (35%) 2016-17: C (41%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	74	75	74	78	66	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	457
Attendance below 90 percent	21	24	12	8	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	1	1	3	7	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	20	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	15	14	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	1	3	15	14	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/31/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	72	75	73	81	68	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	455
Attendance below 90 percent	10	13	4	7	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	13	22	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	7	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	72	75	73	81	68	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	455
Attendance below 90 percent	10	13	4	7	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	13	22	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	7	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	43%	52%	57%	43%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	57%	58%	44%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	66%	55%	53%	56%	53%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	68%	63%	63%	50%	55%	61%
Math Learning Gains	72%	68%	62%	38%	59%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	73%	53%	51%	42%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	41%	48%	53%	14%	42%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	40%	51%	-11%	58%	-18%
	2018	38%	49%	-11%	57%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	48%	56%	-8%	58%	-10%
	2018	39%	51%	-12%	56%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	42%	52%	-10%	56%	-14%
	2018	33%	52%	-19%	55%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	67%	60%	7%	62%	5%
	2018	56%	56%	0%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	76%	65%	11%	64%	12%
	2018	54%	61%	-7%	62%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		22%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				
05	2019	64%	60%	4%	60%	4%
	2018	39%	58%	-19%	61%	-22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		25%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	41%	48%	-7%	53%	-12%
	2018	34%	49%	-15%	55%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	26	63	81	42	76	78	18				
ELL	40	57	63	70	80	81	29				
BLK	25	40	42	63	68	64	26				
HSP	42	60	71	68	74	71	32				
WHT	59	67		74	74		67				
FRL	44	51	62	66	68	69	36				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD		38	43	11	23	23					
ELL	36	24		51	33						
BLK	25	35	23	40	33	25	15				
HSP	37	33	27	47	35	13	36				
WHT	51	50		65	61		53				
FRL	33	35	32	46	36	17	25				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	18	34	59	20	32	35	9				
ELL	35	44	55	48	41		12				
BLK	31	36		52	33						
HSP	38	38	53	44	41	43	15				
WHT	63	65		56	36		10				
FRL	39	39	48	47	35	37	15				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	78
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	496
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	57
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	62
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	62
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	68
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	60
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Black students in ELA demonstrated the lowest performance in proficiency as well as learning gains. Much of the bottom quartile in ELA consista of Black students This appears to be due to low phonics and vocabulary awareness as monitored through i-Ready data and reading intervention data.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Black students in the area of ELA proficiency were the only subgroup that did not demonstrate growth. While it was not a decline, students remained stagnant. Hispanic students in Science also

decreased by 4 percentage points. Lack of science content knowledge and content vocabulary contributed to this decline.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

ELA achievement showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Blackburn's average was 43% and the state's average was 57%. Students' lack reading endurance to demonstrate on state assessments as compared to grade level common assessments.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The data component with the most improvement was Math including achievement, learning gains and bottom quartile. This dramatic increase was due to using Acaletics supplemental math program with fidelity for remediation and enrichment.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

According to the Early Warning Systems, the greatest area of concern at Blackburn are Level 1 students.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Focus on literacy instruction across all content areas to support the different modalities of learning: Brick and Mortar and E-Learning.
2. Increase learning gains in 5th grade ELA/Math and previously retained students currently in 4th grade.
3. K-2 Implementation of Literacy Footprints to adhere to the state policy to provide explicit systematic, multi-sensory, and differentiated instruction to increase students foundational skills in reading.
4. Implementation of Character Strong SEL program to increase students social-emotional development and self-awareness.
5. Increase core instruction in all grade levels to build students content knowledge and vocabulary in science.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	By June 2021, student achievement, with the focus on standards-based instruction and assessment to create grade-level rigorous assignments, will increase ELA and science as measured by state assessments. Based on multiple data sources: FSA (historical data), I-Ready Fall 2019, and FLKRS, demonstrate a need to provide teachers with tools necessary to understand state standards, align instruction, and assess based on level of complexity for each standard.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA 49%; ELA LG 64%; ELA Lower Quartile 74% Science 50%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Latrina Singleton (singleton2l@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Reading Endorsement to support reading across content area Writing Across Content Systematic Vocabulary Instruction K-2 District initiative to support explicit systematic, multi-sensory, differentiated literacy instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Writing across content is substantiated by current research as one of the most important areas aligned to increase student academic achievement across disciplines.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Reading Endorsement Classes K-5
2. Implementation of Literacy Footprints
3. K-3 Being a Writer
4. 4-5 Reading Writing Project (District Initiative)

Person Responsible	Lisa Linton (lintonl@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	By June 2021, math achievement will increase to 70% proficiency as evidenced by state assessments. Rationale Based on multiple data sources, FSA (historical data) and I-Ready Fall 2019, there demonstrates a need to provide teachers with tools necessary to understand state standards, align instruction, and assess based on level of complexity for each standard.
Measurable Outcome:	Math 70%; Math LG 74%; Math Lower Quartile 74%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Danielle Delk (delkd@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	i-Ready math Acaletics for grades 2-5 Differentiated small group instruction Monthly grade level data chats
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Tiered support in mathematics allows the teachers to address particular standards, key concepts and generalizations to provide several pathways for students to arrive at an understanding of these components based on interest, readiness and/or learning profiles.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Use i-Ready and benchmark data to determine specific areas of need 2. Based on area of deficit, teachers will pull differentiated, small groups to support student readiness and/or learning profiles.

Person Responsible	Latrina Singleton (singleton2l@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Barrier: Students were out of school from March of 2020-August 2020. Due to COVID 19 and lack of structured leaning environment will have a impact on student achievement. The MCSD has made adjustments to the curriculum map and pacing to address some of these concerns. Leadership team will work with instructional personnel to close these instructional gaps.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

See detailed information in PFEP.
Adjustments have been identified and noted based on COVID procedures and mandates.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00